



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/598,057

07/30/2008

Tomohiro Fujiki

4812-003

9652

22429

7590

03/16/2011

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP
1700 DIAGONAL ROAD
SUITE 300
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

MCCARRY JR, ROBERT J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/16/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/598,057 | Applicant(s) FUJIKI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner ROBERT J. MCCARRY JR | Art Unit 3617 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15-17 and 21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 12-14 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 12-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa (JP56118407) in view of Kawabata (EP 1386813).

Hasegawa discloses a fence assembly mounted on a railway platform comprised of a plurality of posts, in the form of support boxes 1 positioned along the platform. Each box 1 has openings on either side to allow movement of panels doors 2 through the box to extend to either side of the box. This is shown in figures 1 and 2 which show the side view of the box and door assembly and a top view of the doors passing through both open ends of the box. The doors 2 are wider than the width of the box, also shown in figures 1 and 2. The doors 2 are capable of blocking access from the platform to the tracks and open to allow access to railcars based on the position of the railcars and the doors of the railcars along the platform.

Hasegawa discloses the fence assembly as described above. However, Hasegawa does not specifically show a signaling and control system between the fence assembly and the approaching railcars. Kawabata discloses a platform door control system comprised of a plurality of doors placed along the platform to restrict access from the platform to the railway. The system is further comprised of a command

Art Unit: 3617

transmission system where the door assembly on the platform receives commands from the approaching train with information regarding the position of the train doors. An "OPEN" command is transmitted from the train to the platform doors, the formation information of the train is also transmitted to each individual control apparatus to change the moving distance for opening and closing of the gates at each platform door. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have applied a control system, like that of Kawabata, to a fence assembly, like that of Hasegawa, with the expected result of increasing the efficiency of the fence assembly thereby allowing the doors of the fence assembly to be properly opened and matched with the doors of the railcar in order to quickly and efficiently allow passengers to depart from the train and also board the train.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa (JP56118407).

Claims 5 and 6 recite the use of a roll curtain and an accordion curtain utilized for the door of the fence assembly. Hasegawa discloses a solid sliding door and does not specifically show a roll curtain or accordion curtain. It is well known in the art to one of ordinary skill in the art that roll curtains and accordion curtains can be interpreted as functional equivalents. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to come to the expected result that the solid door could be replaced with a roll curtain or accordion curtain depending on the type of station the fence will be installed with the expected result of reducing damage to the door assembly and therefore reducing maintenance costs.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa (JP56118407).

Claim 13 recites the placement of the posts of the fence assembly in a zigzag pattern along the platform. Hasegawa discloses the posts to be aligned in a straight pattern along the platform and does not specifically state the posts to be in a zigzag pattern. It would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art to have positioned the posts in a zigzag pattern based on the size and type of railway station with the expected result of controlling and maximizing the traffic flow of passengers especially at high travel times during the day.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 15-17 and 21 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17, 20 and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3617

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT J. MCCARRY JR whose telephone number is (571)272-6683. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:00am to 3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, S. Joseph Morano can be reached on (571) 272-6684. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. Joseph Morano/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3617

/R. J. McCarry Jr./
Examiner, Art Unit 3617

RJM
March 7, 2011